

REMARKS

Claims in the case are 1, 7, 8, 14-17, 19, 25 and 28-30 upon entry of this amendment. Claims 1, 7, 17, 19 and 25 have been amended, Claims 28-30 have been added, and Claims 2-6, 9-13, 18, 20-24, 26 and 27 have been cancelled without prejudice herein.

Basis for added Claims 28-30 is found at page 8, lines 20-23 of the specification.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claims 11-13. Accordingly, Claims 2-6 and 9-13 have been cancelled herein. For purposes of improved clarity and connectivity, the first and second polymeric films of Claim 1 have been amended to include recitation of exterior and interior surfaces, basis for which is drawn from Claims 11-13, and the sequence of layers as recited in original Claim 1. Basis for the amendments to the metal layer of Claim 1 with regard to indium and tin and the related percent weights is found at page 5, lines 20-23 of the specification. Basis for the recitation as to light transmittance in the wherein clause of Claim 1 is found at page 8, lines 1-8 of the specification.

Claim 19 has been amended in a manner similar to that of Claim 1 herein. Basis for the amendments to Claim 19 are the same as those discussed previously herein with regard to the amendments to Claim 1.

Additional amendments to the claims will be discussed further herein.

Claims 7 and 11 stand objected to. Claim 7 has been amended herein to replace "form" with --from-- in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion on page 2 of the Office Action of 23 March 2005. Claim 11 has been cancelled by amendment herein. In light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks, the objections to Claims 7 and 11 are deemed to have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present objections to the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 17, 18, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to the amendments herein and the following remarks.

Claim 17 has been amended to delete the recitation as to "high molecular weight" and to include the subject matter of Claim 18 (which depended from Claim

17). Claim 25 has been amended to delete the recitation as to "high molecular weight" and to include the subject matter of Claim 27 (which depended from Claim 25). Accordingly, Claim 27 has been cancelled herein. Claim 26 has also been cancelled as it was a duplicate of original Claim 25.

In light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks, Applicants' claims are deemed to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which they regard as their invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 and 14-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 4,241,129 (**Marton et al**). This rejection is respectfully traversed in light of the amendments herein and the following remarks.

Marton et al discloses a multilayer metal/organic polymer composite that includes: a polymer substrate layer (e.g., of polycarbonate); a metal layer (e.g., of indium and/or tin); a soft adhesive layer (e.g., of polyurethane); and optionally a further polymer layer (e.g., of polycarbonate). See the abstract; column 5, line 15 through column 6, line 5; column 8, lines 6-7; and Table 1 at columns 11-14 of Marton et al.

Marton et al does not disclose, teach or suggest the multi-layer composite of Applicants' claims which includes a first outer polymeric layer of polycarbonate that has glossy exterior and interior surfaces, and a second outer polymeric layer of polycarbonate having an interior surface that is glossy and an exterior surface that is matte.

It is noted that the present rejection does not include Claims 11-13. The subject matter of Claims 11-13 has been incorporated into Claim 1 by amendment herein.

In light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks, Applicants' claims are deemed to be unanticipated by and patentable over Marton et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marton et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed in light of the amendments herein and the following remarks.

Marton et al has been discussed previously herein and discloses a multilayer metal/organic polymer composite that includes: a polymer substrate layer; a metal layer; a soft adhesive layer; and optionally a further polymer layer. See the abstract; column 5, line 15 through column 6, line 5; column 8, lines 6-7; and Table 1 at columns 11-14 of Marton et al.

Marton et al provides no disclosure, teaching or suggestion with regard to a multi-layer composite having a first outer polymeric layer of polycarbonate that has glossy exterior and interior surfaces, and a second outer polymeric layer of polycarbonate having an interior surface that is glossy and an exterior surface that is matte.

In particular, Marton et al provides no disclosure, teaching or suggestion that would motivate a skilled artisan to select the particular combination and positioning of glossy and matte film surfaces of the multi-layered composite of Applicants' present claims. The glossy surfaces of the first polymeric layer of Applicants' presently claimed multi-layer composite provides the multi-layer composite with a mirror-like finish. The inner glossy surface of the second polymeric layer of Applicants' multi-layer composite minimizes cracking of the metal layer thereof (in particular during forming of the composite) which is more than a mere aesthetic property. The matte exterior surface of the second polymeric layer of Applicants' composite minimizes the undesirable entrapment of air between the exterior surface and the surface of a forming tool. Entrapment of air between the exterior surface and the surface of a forming tool is undesirable because, for example, it can result in deformation of the multi-layered composite during the forming operation.

Marton et al provides no disclosure, teaching or suggestion with regard to a multi-layered composite that includes a metal layer consisting of indium in an amount of 85 to 95 percent by weight, and tin in an amount of 5 to 15 percent by weight. In addition, Marton et al provide no teaching or suggestion with regard to a multi-layered composite in which the thickness of the metal layer thereof is selected such that a combination of the metal layer and the polymeric layer on which it is deposited have a light transmittance of 0.1 to 60 percent.


"The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested

the desirability of the modification.” *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266 (Fed. Cir. 1992). “Even when obviousness is based on a single prior art reference, there must be a showing of a suggestion or motivation to modify the teachings of that reference.” *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 U.S.P.Q.2d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

In light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks, Applicants' claims are deemed to be unobvious and patentable over Marton et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the amendments herein and the preceding remarks, Applicants' presently pending claims are deemed to meet all the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and to define an invention that is unanticipated, unobvious and hence, patentable. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the presently pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
James R. Franks
Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,552

Bayer MaterialScience LLC
100 Bayer Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15205-9741
(412) 777-3808
FACSIMILE PHONE NUMBER:
(412) 777-3902